

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexasofan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.repto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/527,287	03/08/2005	Klemens Breitfuss	AT02 0058 US	2726	
65913 NXP. B.V.	7590 03/17/2011		EXAMINER		
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & LICENSING			SYED, N	SYED, NABIL H	
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKA	Y DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, CA 95131			2612		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/17/2011	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail  $\,$  address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/527,287	BREITFUSS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
NABIL H. SYED	2612	

	NABIL H. SYED	2612					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. Me The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal de) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) 🔀 The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) I The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MIPEP 706.071.							
Extersions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been titled if it is dut for to purposes of determining the petited or textension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee have been titled if it is dut for to purposes of determining the petited or textension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension feel under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above. If checked, A ry reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any samed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS							
<ul> <li>3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because         <ul> <li>(a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for</li> </ul> </li> </ul>							
appeal; and/or							
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally re	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).				
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>							
7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: None. Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		II be entered and an e	xplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all ejections under appeal and/or appellant to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFH 4.1.3(3d)(1).							
10. 🗌 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Note below.							
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13.  Other:							
/Brian A Zimmerman/ /NARIL H SVED/							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2612	/NABIL H SYED/ Examiner Art Unit: 2612						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Note: Applicants arguments filed 22/811 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner maintains the rejection made in the final rejection. Applicant admist that in Ooya "fithe data transmission detection unit 208 (or the slave unit) does not detect transmission of a response signal from another slave station and the time has reached the start time of the determined delayed time, the control unit 202 transmits an ID response signal containing the ID of the slave stations (see remarks, page 8, lines 25-29). Ooya further discloses that the slave stations C 501 and D 601 do not transmit the ID response signal since the data transmission detection unit 206 of the slave stations C 501 and D 601 detect transmission of the ID response signal by the slave stations B 401 (see col. 5, lines 1-5; also see (ii.g. 3).). So based on this description of Ooya it can be seen whenever slave stations is about to begin transmitg is ID response signal it will check first if there is another slave station transmitting, which can be interpreted as performing a test, to determine whether another slave stave station stransmitting a response signal (see fig. 3, slave stations is 501 and 601).

In order to further support the arguments, that the technique of carrier sensing before transmitting a response signal is a well known Steeves discloses an interrogation system, wherein a tag that is preparing to transmit will listen for a pattern from another transmitting tag and if the detection indicates a very crowded RF environment the tag determines not to initiate transmission since it is highly probable that such transmission would take place tat the same time as transmission from another tag and might therefore not be properly received by a reader (see cod. 8. lines 44 through cod. 9, lines 3). Note: Steeves is not used to reject the claim it is merely used to indicate that the technique of carries sensing before transmission is a well known technique in the art.

Based on the explanation given above it is the Examiner's postion that the reference applied discisoes the invention as claimed in the present application.